

REMARKS

The pending Office Action addresses and rejects claims 1-18.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicant amends independent claims 1, 13, and 18 to include the limitations of claims 2-4, which are now cancelled. Claims 1, 13, and 18 are also amended to clarify that the horizontal marking extends from the left eye to the right eye, and the vertical marking extends from the upper edge to the cutout portion. Claim 5 is amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter is added.

Rejection Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 5-8, 10, 13, and 15-17 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 09028458 of Kokuni. As indicated above, independent claims 1 and 13 are amended to include the limitations of cancelled claims 2-4, thereby obviating the basis for this rejection.

Rejection Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejects claims 2-4, 11-12, and 14 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kokuni in view of U.S. Patent 3,718,145 of Chateau. The Examiner argues that Kokuni discloses the claimed invention, but fails to teach alignment markings for aligning the template. Thus, the Examiner relies on Chateau to disclose a “fleur-de-lis” design located between the eye holes for aligning the template. The Examiner also rejects claim 9 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kokuni in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,186,190 of Hirzel.

As noted above, independent claims 1, 13, and 18 each recite vertical and horizontal markings for aligning the template. The vertical marking extends from the upper edge to the cutout portion formed in the lower edge, and the horizontal marking extends from the left eye to the right eye. Chateau does not teach or even suggest a vertical marking that extends from the left eye to the right eye, or a horizontal marking that extends from the upper edge to a cutout portion. Rather, as shown in FIG. 1 of Chateau, the “fleur-de-lis” is located between the eye holes and does not come into contact with either eyehole or the upper and lower edges.

Independent claims 1, 13, and 18 therefore distinguish over Kokuni and Chateau and represent allowable subject matter. Dependent claims 9, 11-12, and 14 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Lisa Adams
Registration No.: 44,238

NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2604
(617) 439-2550
(617) 310-9550 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant